

REFLECTIONS  
ON  
TWO DISCOURSES  
CONCERNING  
The Divinity of our Saviour :

Written by Monsieur LAMOTH in *French*, and  
done into English.

---

Written to J. S.

---

---



L O N D O N,  
Printed in the Year MDCXCIII.



## REFLECTIONS on two Discourses concerning the Divinity of our Saviour, &c.

**A**Mong our other Opposers, we are at length attacked by the Preachers; and Monsieur Lamoth, an eminent Demagogue of the French Nation, hath published two of his late Declarations against us.

I know not whether he was chosen to, or put himself upon the Employment; but I will allow, that a more fit Person cannot be readily found for the Work by him undertaken. He hath Art and Address enough; and such a Degree of Confidence, as to be above both *Shame* and *Fear*. If he had either of those, in any Degree, left to him, he would never have said as he does at *pag. 15, 16, 17, 34.* that the *Apostle Paul* had not common Sense, nor any tolerable Degree of Understanding, nay was a Mad-man, and the rest of the *Apostles* were Blasphemers; if we do not grant that the Doctrines of the Trinity and of the Divinity of our Saviour, as they are now held, are true. Concerning all the Writers of the New Testament, he pronounces at once, as here followeth; *I make no Difficulty* (saith he, *p. 33.*) *to assert, they have deceived us most shamefully, and their Writings are no better than continual Blasphemies, if Christ be not true God.* As to the Christian Religion, he saith at *p. 18.* *It hath nothing in it that is great and sublime, if you take from it the Divinity of Jesus Christ.*

'Tis not to be doubted, that in his next he will tell us, our Saviour himself was an Impostor, to speak of himself as he did, if he were the Great Prophet only. But in the mean time, I shall tell him, that 'tis ill manners, nay 'tis unchristian and impious, to set the Persons of the Apostles, and the Holy

Scriptures themselves, on the same Level with the litigated controverted, (*and above* *fore*) doubtful and uncertain Doctrines, of this or the other Party of Christians; so that both must stand or fall together: for 'tis to equal in their Authority our private Interpretations of the Word, with the Word it self. The latter will have its true Value allowed to it, by all wise and good Men, while the other (private Interpretations or Opinions) shall even among *such*, undergo various Changes, be believed in some Ages, and rejected in others; which (all learned Men know) has been the Fortune of the Doctrines, in Debate between us and the Church.

But Monsieur Lamoth is heartily troubled; that, if you take away the Divinity of our Saviour, we shall find our Religion to contain nothing that is GREAT or SUBLIME, *p. 18.* The Socinians, on the contrary, judge, that the Design of Religion being (confessedly) this, *to direct our Conversation and Manners,* 'tis no Matter how plain and obvious it is; and that it being intended for the Unlearned and Vulgar, as well as for others, there was a Necessity, it should neither be *sublime* nor *great*. We are well satisfied with the Character that *Moses* and *St. Paul* give of Religion; 'Tis not in Heaven, or beyond the Sea, or in the Deep, (as who should say, 'tis neither sublime nor mysterious) but 'tis in thy Mouth and Heart, that thou mayst do it. As if he had said, 'Tis an easy intelligible thing, congenit and comate to every Man; that none may say 'twas sublime, and he understood it not, 'twas great, and he could not grasp it. This is the Description that *Moses* makes of true Religion,

*Deut. 30. 12. And St. Paul repeating his Words, applies them to the Gospel, This is the Word of Faith (says he) that we preach, Rom. 10. 8. But Mr. Lamoth and his Party are not for such a Religion, they must have a Religion that is great and sublime; and accordingly they have contrived to themselves such a Religion, a Religion of which they not only say, but profess and boast, that 'tis above and beyond all Reason.*

You require of me, Sir, that I should examine the Defence that Monsieur Lamoth hath made of the great and sublime Religion; I will do so in the following Method :

1. I will make short Remarks on the General Arguments dispersed up and down in his two Discourses, as his Translator has complemented him, though he should have said his two Declamations.

2. I will give an Account of the Texts, which (whether they will or no) he hath impressed to serve his Cause.

### *On his general Arguments.*

I Omit that he is pleased to call us, p. 52, 55, 62, 63. *Enemies of Jesus, the Profane, Innovators, Adversaries of the Lord Jesus, near Neighbours to Irrigion*: for these are Complements that some Preachers readily bestow on as many as differ from them. Though again, when he is in the Mood, (as at p. 62.) he confesses, that we seem to be innocent Lambs: and that in our Writings are found *glittering Notions, and ingenious Explications*. We won't thank him for the Acknowledgments which Truth it self has extorted from him; nor will I resent much his ill Language to us: but I will endeavour to treat him, though somewhat sharply, yet in a more Gentleman-like way.

He saith, p. 52, 53, 54. 'By denying the Divinity of our Saviour we make the Bible the strangest Book in the World.—The Old Testament will scarcely have the least Agreement with the New; we find nothing but Thwartings and Contradictions between them.

—This once supposed (*viz.* that Christ is not the most High God) 'tis evident, that Christ came not to fulfil the Law and Prophets, but utterly to confound and destroy them. Let us speak only of the New Testament:—What a Book shall we have of it, if Jesus Christ be not God?—The New Testament is full of ancient Oracles (*be meanth of Quotations out of the Old Testament*) to the Honour of the Living God: but 'tis as clear as the Noon-day, that the Applications that the Apostles make of them are more childish Triflings and Blasphemies, if our Saviour by one of his Natures be not the Living God.

Afterwards, at p. 53, 54. he proceeds to tell us, how the Holy Ghost ought (saith he) to have spoken, if Jesus Christ be not God. For if he is God, the Holy Spirit (according to this Author) has been as faulty and as blasphemous as the very new Testament and the Apostles are. Let us hear what he saith;—Why, say the Socinians, might not the Holy Ghost speak magnificently of that Redeemer, to whom we are so vastly obliged, and whom Providence has raised to such a Degree of Glory? For that Reason say I (*I Monsieur C. G. Lamoth*) the Holy Ghost ought to have spoke with more Reservedness of the Glory of Christ. The greater he is, the more is the Danger of his being taken for God; his very Greatness makes us the more stand in need of Preservatives.—If he had not been God, the Excess of our Obligations to him should have obliged the Holy Ghost not to speak of him: Or at least, seeing it was not possible to teach his Doctrine without speaking of his Person, to make use of such Expressions as might make it evident, that he is not God. It was necessary, in most express Terms, and on several Occasions, to tell Men, this Jesus, whom you worship, is not God for all that.—Neither can any thing be said in the Case, (*be meanth, that the Holy Ghost has not spoke as Mr. Lamoth here directs*) but only this, that the Holy Ghost was willing to deceive us.



Hold, *Jehu*; lest instead of hearing that thou drivest furiously; they call to thee, that thou drivest madly. Declamations did I call these Sermons; they are *Debaschations*: For I will affirm, that no Example or Instance can be given of a bold and heady Writer, who hitherto ever durst exalt his Opinion, or the Opinion of his Party, above the Apostles, the Scriptures, and the Holy Ghost it self; so that if the former were not allowed or supposed to be true, the other must be mere Blasphemies, Blaspheemers and Fools.

If the hundred and fifty Sects, or more, into which Christianity is divided, should all fall to scribbling, and should be as extravagant in their Imputations on the Bible, as this Frenchman has dared to be, what would become of the Christian Religion? It would be turned into Ridicule, by all that heard us, magnifying so much our own Glosses, Interpretations or Opinions, and regarding the Text it self, and the Authors of it so little.

Our present Author's Book is vouched or licensed by two French Ministers, who tell us, that being appointed by the rest of their Brethren to read it, they find it entirely conformable to the constant Doctrine of the French Protestants. I will not believe them, though they gave it upon Oath; for it never was the Doctrine of the French Protestants, nor of any Protestants, no nor of any Christian, that if their Creed be not true, the Apostles were *Mad-men*, the Scriptures *Blasphemies*, and the Holy Ghost knew not how to speak as he ought; which are Words often repeated by Mr. *Lamoth*.

But you will say, Sir, but Mr. *Lamoth* has perhaps some particular and especial Grounds for his unusual Confidence; he hath advanced something that is wholly new, and very forcible, in behalf of the Doctrines of the Trinity, and our Saviour's Divinity. Nothing less, I assure you; you may meet with as much in every Catechism, and with much more in every little System: I mean, setting aside his gaudy Flourishes and childish Exaggerations upon mere *Nothings*; his Exclamations, and other Schemes of *School-boys and Preachers*

*Rhetoric*, with which the World has been so long tired, as to nauseate them. But this you will better see when we come to the Examination of his Texts.

2. To his own ridiculous Confidence of his Opinion, he adds as a farther Strength to it, some (impertinent) Quotations out of the *Fathers*, particularly from *Tertullian* and *Gregory*, surnamed *Thaumaturgus*. He says farther at p. 61. that the Doctrine he has asserted in these Sermons is the *Doctrine of the Primitive Church*. And at p. 162. that *Christians have been in possession of it above these sixteen Centuries*. I suspected all along what an observant Reader of *Fathers* and Church-History Mr. *Lamoth* is; but here he himself has shewed us, he considers not so much, as how many *Years* he is to reckon, from this present Year to our Saviour. Why, Man, the Socinians will give to thee and thy Fellow Tritheists the whole 16 Centuries which thou here insistest on, and are content with the *seventeenth*, of which (it should seem) thou knowest nothing. The Century of our Saviour and the Apostles, the *seventeenth* from us, is to us instead of all the rest; and in the Opinion of all true Protestants that alone is worth more than all the rest, if they were never so many Sixteens more. But we are ready to contest it in the Presence of all the learned World, from the (genuine) Writings of the *Fathers* before the *Nicene Council*, that the Doctrine of the present Church, of three equal, consubstantial and co-eternal Persons, now called the *Trinity*, was expressly rejected by them; that is to say, as consubstantial, co-eternal and co-equal, are now understood by the Church, and opposed by the Unitarians.

Trinitarians boast in vain of the (pretended) Consent of the ancient Church with them, till they can answer the first Dissertation on the *τρεῖς ἑνότητες* or *Quaternio* of Dissertations, written by *S. Cuvicellus* against *S. Marcellinus*, concerning the Judgment of the *Fathers* and the Primitive Church, in the Questions of the Divinity of our Saviour, the Words *Trinity*, *Consubstantial*, &c. Neither *Marcellinus*, though an able and learned Person, nor any

for him, have offered to reply; and the more learned of the Trinitarians, amongst the rest D. Petavius, and the learned and exact Dr. Cudworth, have owned the Dissent of the ancient Church from the present, about the Sense of the Words *Consubstantial, Co-eternal, and Co-equal*, in which the whole Controversy concerning the Trinity doth consist.

3. From p. 55 to p. 61. he considers the Difficulties advanced by the Socinians (or Unitarians) on behalf of the Unity of God, and against the (imagined) Divinity of our Saviour; he *handily* distinguishes them into Heart-Difficulties, Wit-Difficulties, and Scripture-Difficulties: *Heart-Difficulties* being a new sort of *Cant*, he explains by saying, p. 55, 56. that such is the Temper the Heart of Man hath received from the Impressions of Sin, that whatsoever comes from Heaven is suspected, though indeed there be no other Reason to suspect it, but that it comes from Heaven. And again, Heaven saith it, this is sufficient for Man to doubt, deny it, contradict it.

This is a *Slander upon humane Nature*; 'tis inconsistent with our rational Faculty or Power of Reasoning; and the Experience of Mankind contradicts it. For every Body knows that the general Fault of the World is not *Unbelief*, but *Inconsideration*, and an Omission or Neglect of Duty from a *vain Hope* and Expectance that we have yet time enough and to spare, in which to amend all Faults, and to make our Peace with Heaven. But if Mr. Lamosh is indeed acquainted with any, who therefore will not believe, because *Heaven* hath said it, as he affirms; my Advice to him is, to let those *resolute* People alone, for if they will not believe *Heaven*, they will much less believe *him*.

But as to all these Difficulties (the Heart-difficulties, Wit-difficulties, and Scripture-difficulties) which he hath pursued in divers Pages, he hath represented them so *meanly*, as well as answered them so *weakly*, that the Socinians own them not for theirs. We desire the Reader to inform himself of the Difficulties or Arguments advanced by the Soci-

nians, not from Mr. Lamosh, but from our own Writings, that is to say, from the *Brief Notes on the Creed* of Athanasius; the first Letter in the *Brief History of the Unitarians*; the Letter of Resolution concerning the Trinity and Incarnation; the Trinitarian Scheme, with Notes thereupon; the Answers to Dr. Sherlock, Dr. Wallis, and Mr. Milbourn. In which Pamphlets he will see enough to furnish him out against a much abler Sophister than Monsieur Lamosh.

His last General Argument against us is this, that we cannot endeavour the Propagation of our Opinions without troubling the Peace of Mens Consciences, and setting Christians together by the Ears. They own us, saith he, to be in a State of Salvation, and that we have retained all the Fundamental and saving Points of Christianity; where therefore is the *Charity* of these rash Persons, to shake a Doctrine which cannot be attacked with any Success, without filling the Consciences of Men with Trouble, and shedding whole *Torrents* of Christian Blood? Such a Design as this cannot be the Effect of any thing but *Pride*: they have a Mind to distinguish themselves by the Novelty of their Opinions, and to advance their own Glory, by abating that of Jesus Christ. This is the Sum of what he saith, p. 62, 63.

He is the unhappiest Man alive at arguing a Point, whether great or small. Let us suppose it to be as he says, that Trinitarians have retained all the Fundamental Points of Christianity; must we not therefore open our Mouths in Defence of so sacred a Truth as the Unity of God? The Papists have retained all the Fundamental Points of Christianity, in opinion of all Protestants but the Socinians; their Fault and Error is only this, that they have added abundance of Wood, Hay and Stubble, to the Gold, Silver and precious Stones: Shall I say hereupon with this Author, *where therefore was the Charity of those rash Persons, the Authors of the French Reformation, to fill the Consciences of Men with Trouble, and hazard the shedding (nay actually to shed, as they did) whole Torrents of Christian Blood?* He saith, p. 62.

No-

Nothing can warrant the Attempts of the Socinians, if the Doctrine which Trinitarians teach and believe is *consistent with Salvation*. Then say I, what shall excuse the first Reformers, *Luther and Calvin*, for Protestants believe Popery to be *consistent with Salvation*? and I do not think that this bold Man himself will say, all Papists are damned.

But I desire to know of him, why *Torrents of Christian Blood must be shed*, on Occasion of the Socinians peaceable Declaration of the Reasons which convince them of the Unity of God, and their modest Defence of themselves, from the Imputations of being *Innovators, Enemies of the Lord Jesus, near Neighbours to absolute Irreligion*; and such like barbarous and inhumane Scandals? He doth not think the Socinians will shed his Blood, or any Man's else. He owns, p. 62. that we (at least) seem to be *innocent Lambs*; nay our Principles and Carriage have wrestled also this from him: I am willing (saith he) to believe, that they cherish nothing of the Spirit of Persecution. What Danger then is there, that Torrents of Christian Blood should be shed? The Truth is, were it not for the *Pyrethra*, there never had any Blood been shed, by occasion of the Questions and Disputes about Religion? Matters had been fairly reasoned, and we should have thank'd one another for the Light and Information we received from one another, were it not that the *Preachers* by their importune Clamours have always set one Part of the Christian Flock against the other: They have been nothing less, for the Generality of them, than their Office requires, even *Preachers of mutual Candour, Charity, Forbearance, Love, ingenuous Freedom of Mind*, against the unhappy Biases of Education, Prepossession, Interest, and other Adversaries, to the Discovery of Truth, whether Religious or Philosophical.

It can be *nothing*, he saith, but our Pride, and a Desire to advance our own Glory by the Novelty of our Opinions, that occasions our Dissent from other Christians. Nay so wicked are we, as well as vain, that to ex-

alt our selves we care not how we abuse Jesus Christ, whom we profess to be our Redeemer and Saviour: But Mr. *Laneth* should have been very sure of it before he proclaimed to all People, that we honour our selves more than we honour Jesus Christ, nay to the Dishonour of Jesus Christ; and that our Bottom is nothing but *Pride*. 'Tis *nothing*, it should seem wish him, that we have this Charge given to us in the very first Commandment, *Thou shalt have no other Gods but me*; no other; whether they be real Persons, or only *imaginary and fictitious ones*. 'Tis *nothing* that our Saviour says to the young Man whom he loved, *Why callest thou me Good, there is none good save one, that is God*. Nothing that St. Paul tells all Christians; *there is one God, and one Mediator between God and Men, the Man Jesus Christ*. Nothing that an Almighty Father, an Almighty Son, and an Almighty Spirit, different in Number from both, can no more be conceived to be one Almighty, than a mortal Father, a mortal Son, and a third Person who also is mortal, can be conceived to be but one Mortal, nor three Mortals. If you require *Scripture*, we bring the express Words of our Saviour, at *John 17. 3. the Father* (saith he there) *is the only true God*. If you demand *Reason*, we demonstrate it with more than mathematical Certainty, that three *Divine Persons* must needs be three Gods, because *three Divine Persons* is nothing else but the Periphrasis or Circumlocution for *three Gods*, even as *three human Persons* and *three angelical Persons* are the Circumlocutions or Periphrases for *three Men* and *three Angels*. Mr. *Laneth's* Answer is, that all this (and an hundred times more) is *nothing*. 'Tis true indeed, that the Sun cannot shine so brightly as to force it self to be seen; for after all, 'tis but shutting ones Eyes, and the Sun shines in vain.

He urges us with it, that we grant that Trinitarians have retained *all the Fundamental Articles of Religion*. With grants it? First, they themselves own, that if they are mistaken, they are *Idolaters*; they are conscious, nay they profess and dispute for it, that they are.

are guilty of Polytheism, if there be no such Persons as they have imagined, even an *eternal* Son of God, and an Almighty and Living Spirit, different in Number from that Son, and from God the Father of all.

But the Socinians grant it: I cannot answer for every particular Writer of the Socinians; for my own part, I shall never grant that the Unity of God, or but one *Divine* Person, is not a Fundamental Article. My Reason is this; 'tis confessed on all sides, that both the Covenants (the Old as well as the New) is between the one true God, on the one part, and his Servant *Man* on the other: but if so, the Covenant is utterly dissolved on our Part, if besides this one true God with whom we are in Covenant, we set up, and equal also with him, another Person or Persons, whether *real* or *imaginary* ones: I mean such as knowingly do so; and worship accordingly. As the Covenant of Allegiance and Protection (Allegiance on the Part of the People, and Protection on the Part of the King) is broken on the Peoples Part, if they set up or own any other Person as King, besides him who of Right is so. But come we now to the true Strength of his Book, the Texts that he hath alledged.

*On his first Proposition from the Words of his Text.*

**H**E chooseth for his Subject or Text the Words of St. Paul, Phil. 6. 7. *Who bring in the Form of God, thought it not Robbery to be equal with God, but made himself of no Reputation, and took upon him the Form of a Servant, and was made in the Likeness of Men.* He saith these Words present us with three Propositions.

1. That Jesus Christ *was* before he was in the Form of Man.

2. That he was in the Form of God before he was in the Form of Man.

3. That he thought it not Robbery to be equal with his heavenly Father.

The first of these, that Jesus *was* before he

was in the Form of Man, he proveth thus: The Text says, that *bring in the Form of God, he humbled himself*; or as 'tis in the Original, *he emptied himself*. But *what Sense* shall we make of the Words, saith he, if it be not true, that our Saviour before his Birth of the Blessed Virgin, was in a more glorious State than was that State upon which he entered at his Nativity?

'Tis an Impiety that runs through our Author's whole Book, that the Scriptures have not spoken Sense, if they do not always mean as he would have them. I pray, Sir, see the seventh Chapter of the Answer to Mr. Milbourn, and then tell me, whether the Socinians have not made Sense of St. Paul's Words, without supposing (as Trinitarians here do) that Paul advanceth another, or a second God! It is shown there, that to be *in the Form of God*, is common to our Saviour with all other Men: all Men (say the Scriptures) are made in the Similitude, Form or Likeness of God, *Jam. 3. 9*. But our Blessed Saviour was more in the Form or Likeness of God than any other Man or Men, because he had a more perfect Holiness, and a miraculous Power and Authority over the Devils, Diseases, the Sea, the Winds, for the Confirmation of that Doctrine which he was to deliver to Men in the Name of God.

Our English Translation adds, *he thought it not Robbery to be equal with God*. But 'tis now known even to School-boys, that the Greek Words should have been rendered to a just contrary Purpose: their Lexicon upon the Greek Testament (made by the industrious and learned G. Pasor) teaches them to read here; *Non rapuit aequalitatem cum Deo*; he assumed not to himself to be equal with God. So that the Sense is, though the Lord Christ was in a greater Likeness to God than ever any other Creature was, yet he was far from imitating the Pride and Ambition of Lucifer, he took not on him to be equal with God; but on the contrary, he took on him the Form of a Servant, that is, to set us an Example of Humility and mutual Toleration, he submitted to Reproach; and even to Blows, with.

without reviling again, or other ways avenging himself on those that wronged him.

Every one knows what Great *Erasmus* hath said upon this Text, that though the Fathers were wont to urge it against the *Arians*, to prove that the Son is God equal with the Father; yet the Apostle, saith he, had no such Intention. Therefore he approveth the Explication of St. *Ambrose*, *Non defendit sibi aequalitatem*; Christ did not defend himself to be equal with God. *M. Luther*, the first Reformer (*lib. de duplici just.*) admonishes his Readers, that we must not understand this Text affirmatively, but negatively; not as saying that Christ made himself equal with God, but as denying that he is equal with God; which I mention only that the less learned Reader may know, that besides the Socinians, some of the principal Interpreters and Critics, among our Opposers themselves, have been aware, that this is not a Context to be insisted on, as a Proof of our Saviour's Divinity.

Our Translation goes on; and took on him the Form of a Servant, and was made in the Likeness of Men. I could never yet see any Greek Testament that so reads the Words; and I dare affirm that no Greek Copy, whether Printed or Manuscript, so reads. All the Original Copies (with one Consent) read thus; But made himself of no Reputation, taking the Form of a Servant: being made in the Likeness of Men, and found in fashion as a Man, (that is, being a Man like to all other Men; so the Trinitarian Interpreters themselves understand the Words) he humbled himself, and became obedient to Death, even the Death of the Cross; i.e. he submitted to the unjust Powers that then were, and cheerfully underwent Death, even the painful and ignominious Death of the Cross. This, all learned Men know and own, is the true Reading of this Text; and it blows away at once all the little Devices that Monsieur *Lamoth* uses to pervert its plain and obvious meaning.

But in pursuance of this first Proposition from this Text, that Christ was before he was made Man, he urges divers other Texts, nine in all.

1. He saith, that Jesus Christ declares, that he was come down from Heaven, and that he was in Heaven, before ever he ascended thither. We answer, Mr. *Lamoth* makes use of a peculiar Bible of his own; he will never be able to show us such a Text in any Bible but that which is in his private Custody.

2. John the Baptist saith, John 1. 30. After me cometh a Man who is preferred before me, for he was before me. We answer with his learned Country-man Th. *Bez*, the Lord Christ was preferred before John, because though he was after John in Time, yet he was before him in Merit and Dignity.

3. But St. Paul says, 1 Cor. 10. 9. Neither let us tempt Christ, as some of them (the Israelites in the Wilderness) tempted, and were destroyed of Serpents. This Text were indeed to the Purpose of our Saviour's Pre-existence, if it had been said here, that the Israelites in the Wilderness tempted (i.e. murmured against) Christ. But this is not said; and 'tis certain they tempted God, not the Lord Christ.

4. It is said of Moses, Heb. 11. 26. He preferred the Reproach of Christ before the Treasures of Egypt. We answer, with almost all the Commentators on the Scriptures; the Israelites were reproached by their Oppressors the Egyptians, with their Hopes of a Saviour, or Messiah, or Christ; but Moses preferred this Reproach, as the Egyptians counted it, before all the Treasures of Egypt.

5. Our Saviour again saith, John 8. 58. Before Abraham was I am. It is to be understood as when 'tis said of the same our Lord Christ, Rev. 13. 8. The Lamb who was slain from the Beginning of the World. Christ was, and was slain before Abraham, and before the Foundation of the World, not actually, but in the Ordination and Decree of God. Accordingly St. Peter saith of him, 1 Pet. 1. 20. Who verily was fore-ordained (not only before Abraham, but) before the Foundation of the World, but was manifest in these last Days.

6. We are assured by St. Peter, 1 Pet. 3. 19. Jesus Christ preached to the Spirits that were disobedient in the Time of Noah. Here again he maketh use of his own private Bible; when

B he



he puts the Text in the Words of the known and authentick Bibles, we will give him an Account of it. In the mean time he may see it explained, and the Explication warranted by the Authority of thirty Fathers, in the fourth Letter of the *Brief History of the Unitarians*.

7. 'Tis affirmed by the Evangelist *John*, ch. 1. 1. *In the Beginning was the WORD. We answer, In the Beginning of the Gospel-State Christ was.*

8. The same Evangelist saith, *John* 1. 3. *All things were made by him (by the WORD) and without him was not any thing made, that was made.* We grant it, in that Sense in which only 'tis consistent and reconcilable with those innumerable Texts which assure us, that only God was the Maker of the first or old Creation. But *St. John* speaks here of the new Creation, or the Gospel-Oeconomy and State, that *new Heavens and new Earth, wherein dwelleth Righteousness.* This Creation was begun by the Ministry, and perfected by the Directions of the Lord Christ; who hath made all things new, by abolishing Judaism and Paganism, Ceremony and Idolatry, and introducing in their room moral Righteousness, and the Knowledge of the one true God. All these (great) things were made by him, (or as the Original may be rendred, *done by him*) and without him was nothing done that was done. But of this I have spoken fully, and I hope satisfactorily and effectually, with respect to considering Men, at Chap. 3. of the Answer to Mr. Milbourn.

9. He finds too the Pre-eternity of our Saviour, even in the *Proverbs* of Solomon, who introduceth Wisdom as saying, *When there were no Depths, — before the Mountains were settled, before the Hills was I brought forth,* Prov. 8. 24, 25. It falls out here somewhat unluckily, for our Author, and such learned and judicious Interpreters as he is, that if this Wisdom must needs be (not a Quality or Property, but) a real and a divine Person, she was a Goddess, not a God. For 'tis undeniable that Solomon speaks of her as a Female: She begins her Discourse at the first Verse of this Chap-

ter; *Doth not Wisdom cry, and Understanding lift up HER Voice? SHE standeth at the Top of the High Places; — SHE crieth at the Gates.*

*On his second and third Propositions.*

HIS second Proposition from his Text is, our Saviour was in the Form of God before he was in the Form of a Servant: which he taketh to be the same with this; he was in the Form of God before he was Man. He giveth two Reasons:

1. Because 'tis said here, *being in the Form of God, he emptied himself:* So he translates the Words instead of the Vulgar English, *He made himself of no Reputation.*

2. Because otherways, the Opposition here plainly intended by the Apostle, will not be exact: for if the Form of God must be taken figuratively, so as only to make this Sense, *he was like unto God*, was the Similitude or Likeness of God, as all other Men are; it will not answer to the other Member of the Opposition, which is not Figure but Reality; for the Form of a Servant, and the Likeness of Men, was intended to signify that Christ was a real Man, and not only that he was like to Men.

'Tis a very thin Sophistry this: When our Author lets off to speak to the Vulgar, and would needs underrake (in this Passage) to speak to the Learned, he should have brought something that was more substantial, wherewith to blind such Eyes as theirs.

First; he saith, *Jesus Christ was in the Form of God*; that is, he was really God before he was Man; because this Text adds, *that he emptied himself.* Methinks that very Translation which our Author has affected, should have minded him of the Absurdity and absolute Impossibility of his Doctrine; for can he that is true God empty himself? can he lessen, much less evacuate himself? To what Labyrinths, to what Mazes and Wildernesses does Error lead Men: God, they are forced to say, emptied himself; their next News

will



will be, *he ceased to be*, or was *annihilated*. But God is not only *necessarily existent*, as Philosophers speak, but he is always *necessarily the same*; no Change, much less any *emptying himself* (as they have learned to *cant*) can befall to him.

And why is this Preacher so hard to understand, that our Lord Christ might indeed (as he calls it) empty himself, though he were not God? Why cannot he call it an emptying himself, that our Saviour submitted to Apprehension, Persecution, Scourging and Death, at that very time when he could, by his miraculous Power, have destroyed all his Enemies, both Jews and Romans? Why must we say Christ was in the Form of God, and interpret it thus, that he *was God before he was Man*, on the Account that he *emptied himself*; when the very contrary is so obvious and easy to be discerned, even this, that he *was not God, because he could and did empty himself*?

Secondly; But the Opposition intended by the Apostle, he saith, will not be exact, if the Form of God must not signify Reality, as well as the Form of a Servant. Who told our Author, that the Form of a Servant here must be taken in Reality? Was our Saviour really a Servant to any Person? Do not all Men know, that he was only in the Form of a Servant, by his voluntary bearing of Injuries and Blows, without answering again, or avenging himself; that he might teach us by his Example, as well as by his Doctrine, to forgive one another? The Opposition is most exact: for as he was in the Form of God, without being really God; so he was in the Form of a Servant, without really being Servant to any. But Mr. Lamothe would clap together these two, was in the Form of a Servant, and was in the Likeness of Men; as if they were one, or signified the same thing: and it is upon this Mistake that his Argument proceeds; But the Form of a Servant, and the Likeness of Men, are most different things: and he ought also to have been aware, that a new Sense begins at these Words, *Being made in the Likeness of Men*, as I have shown before.

His last Proposition, from his Text, is, that Jesus Christ did not think it Robbery to be equal with God; so he words his Proposition at p. 9. I have observed before, that now the very Boys know, that *ἀφ' οὐδὲν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς*, is not to be rendered, *he thought it not Robbery to be equal with God*; but *non rapuit equalitatem cum Deo*, he assumed not to himself to be equal with God. If Monsieur Lamothe knew of this Translation, but *dissembled it*, he prevaricated with his Hearers, and sought *disingenuously* to impose upon them: if he knew of it, but *disliked it*, why did he not give his Reasons against it?

Here our Author takes leave of his Text, and falls to proving our Saviour's Divinity from the 3<sup>d</sup> Chapter of St. John's Gospel: the Words he picketh out are these; *As the Father raiseth up the Dead, and quickeneth them, even so the Son quickeneth whom he will. — That all Men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father. — The Hour is coming, and now is, when the Dead shall hear the Voice of the Son of God; and they that hear shall live. For as the Father hath Life in himself, so hath he given to the Son, to have Life in himself.* And as if these Words had ended the whole Controversy between him and the Socinians, he falls to his French *Rhodomontades*, and *Pedagogical Triumphs*. He tells us, 'Tis impossible for any to equal himself more positively with God than our Saviour here doth in these Words: They do not in the least need a Commentary to warrant us, to say with St. Paul, that our Saviour thought it not Robbery to be equal with God his Father.

He takes no notice, that in what Sense soever we are to understand it, that the Son quickeneth whom he will, and is to be honoured as the Father, and will make the Dead to hear his Voice, and hath Life in himself: yet he professeth here, that the Father hath given them to him: that is, he professeth that himself is not God, because he hath not these Powers of himself, but by the Goodness and Gift of another Person. Our Author too passes it over, that as a farther Caution against being mistaken by any, our Saviour solemnly prefacts his

whole Discourse here with these Words, *Verily, verily, I say to you, the Son can do nothing of himself, nothing by his own proper Power and Authority; and that he concludeth them with another Antidote, against being either misunderstood or misrepresented, even with this, the Works which the Father hath given me (hath given me Command and Power) to finish, bear witness of me, that the Father hath sent me, i. e. that I am the Father's Messenger and Ambassador.* Finally, he omitteth too, that all these Expressions are so interpreted by the more Learned even of his own Party, as that they suppose that our Lord Christ here speaks of himself only as a *Man*: for they say, *the Son quickeneth whom he will*, in that he raised from the dead *Lazarus*, the Widow's Son, and some others, and could have raised many more, even as many as he should please. And *all Men should honour the Son as they honour the Father*; because the Ambassador representing the Majesty of him that sends him, his Person is *sacrosanct*, and in divers Respects to be honoured as his *Principal* is, by the Law of Nations. Again, *the Dead shall hear the Voice of the Son of God*; for he would call divers from the Dead, as former Prophets had done. 'Tis added, last of all, *he hath Life in himself*: all agree, that the meaning is, he so possesseth the Fountain of Life, by the Gift of God, as that he restoreth Life to whomsoever he will. If Mr. *Lamoth* was not aware of these Interpretations, 'tis his *Dulness* or his *Negligence*; if he was, that he dissembles them, is his *Dis honesty*: our respect to his Coat I am desirous to think the former.

I see nothing further that is considerable in his first Discourse, but an impious Reflection on the Person of our Saviour, and another on the Scriptures. Of our Saviour he saith at p. 19. that if he is not God, the Sum of the Christian Religion will be this, that a certain Teacher is come to instruct Men by exact Morality, and by a perfect Example, with regard to those Virtues that we ought to practise in our Lives; but against whom are some things to be objected, with regard to those

*Virtues that are of use at the Point of Death.* This usual Scandal of some Trinitarians upon our Saviour, that he was *passionous* or fearful at the Point of Death, is fully answered at Chap. 11. pag. 55. of the Answer to Mr. *Milbourn*. But I wonder that they should not consider that this (false) Charge of theirs against our common Master is much more colourable on their Hypothesis, and much less excusable than on ours: For we say, the Lord Christ was a Prophet; they say, he was also God. Now that a *Man* should have quick Apprehensions of approaching Death, especially of a Death shameful, painful and undesired, is no wonder, because is not sinful; but that a *God-man*, as they think him, should be disturbed at Death, is altogether unaccountable.

As to the Scriptures, he says at p. 20. If Jesus Christ was no more than a *Man*, those Texts of Scripture that speak of that wonderful Mercy and Love of God, in giving this Saviour to Mankind, *have no Sense at all*. He affirms moreover, that for God to make only a *Crucifixion*, that by his Means he might save so many Millions of Men, *was no more than if he had given a Straw to save them*. I had thought (I confess) that French Ministers would not have licensed such Outrages to the Press: And if it was with so little Regard to the Honour of our Saviour, and to the Holy Scriptures, that they managed their Controversies in France, I had almost said they were deservedly banish'd.

To his Objections concerning the Names of God, which he saith are also given to the Lord Christ in Holy Scripture.

MR. *Lamoth's* second Discourse begins with an Acknowledgment, that to mistake a *Man* for God is the most dangerous of all Errors whatsoever. Is it so, then why has he said so often, that nothing can excuse the Socinians for opposing the Doctrine of our Saviour's Divinity? For if that Doctrine is an Error,

Error, he himself has confess'd, *'tis the most dangerous of all Errors whatsoever.* But he saith, that Doctrine is no Error; for that our Saviour is true God, is made evident by these three Observations.

1. He hath the *Names of God* given to him by the Writers of Holy Scripture.

2. Besides the Names of God he hath also the *Attributes of God* ascribed to him.

3. And to put the whole Matter out of doubt, the *Worship* due only to God is also given in Scripture, and there required to be given to him.

First; The Lord Christ hath the *Names of God* given to him, *John 1. 1.* *THE WORD was God.* Nay he is called the *true God*, and the *great God*, *1 John 5. 20. Titus 2. 3.* He saith moreover, that *St. Paul* writing to *Titus*, called our Saviour God, at least four or five times; and after a Line or two forgetting himself, he saith in that short Epistle, Christ is called God *three or four times.* Finally, he citeth some Texts in which he thinketh the Name *Jehovah* is bestowed on our Lord Christ: But because we are sure he cannot shew us that Jesus Christ is once called God in the Epistle to *Titus*, but only out of that single Bible which is in his own keeping; and because the Words of *St. John*, *the true God*, and of *St. Paul*, *the great God*, are evidently spoken not of our Saviour, but of God; and because what he saith of the Name *Jehovah*, that 'tis applied to our Saviour Christ, is abundantly answered at *Ch. 2. of the Answer to Mr. Milbourn*; therefore here I shall only consider what he hath offered on the other Texts, in which (as 'tis commonly supposed) our Saviour hath the Name *God* given to him.

He takes notice, that *we* answer, that our Saviour is called *God* sometimes, because he represented the Person of God, bringing to us the *Commands of God*; for which Reason *Moses* is called God, and that by God himself; *Exod. 7. 1.* *See I have made thee a God to Pharaoh.* *Solomon* also is in this Respect called God, *Psal. 45. 6, and 11.* and so are the Magistrates, Princes and Judges of *Israel*, not only at *Psal. 82. 6.* but by our Saviour, *John*

*10. 34, 35.* Nay it appears by *1 Sam. 28. 11, 13, 14.* that the Prophets who spoke in the Name and Person of God, were therefore called *Elohim*, Gods. To the Examples of *Solomon* and *Samuel* Mr. Lamont saith nothing, I suppose, because he saw that neither of his two Shifts would serve him at all against those evident Instances: But to that of *Moses* he saith, his being a God is limited to *Pharaoh*; 'tis said of him by God, *I have made thee a God to Pharaoh*, not to others. But our Saviour is called God *absolutely*, without any Limitation to this or that Person or Persons. To the Example of the Princes and Judges of *Israel*, he saith, 'tis not any Magistrate in particular, who is ever called God, but all of them in general; but our Saviour is in particular called God.

Let us begin with his second Answer, that no Prince or Magistrate in particular is called God; but it is said of them in general only, *Ye are Gods.* But why has Mr. Lamont parted with such a Secret, that he understands not *Grammar*, no nor common Sense? For does not every sensible Man know, that *Generals* include in them *Particulars*? If I say to many, *Ye are Gods*, do I not thereby say to every one of those many, *Thou art a God*? When the King saith to his House of *Peters*, *My Lords*; or to the other House, *Gentlemen*; doth he not acknowledge every one of the former to be a Lord, and every one of the other to be a Gentleman? And why hath our Author so unadvisedly said, that no Magistrate, Prince or Angel, is ever in particular called God or a God in Holy Scripture? *Samuel* and *Solomon* are so called in particular, *Psal. 45. 6, 11. 1 Sam. 28. 11, 13, 14.* The Angel that spoke to *Moses* in the burning Bush, is called God; and so is *Moses* himself, *Exod. 3. 2, 4. Exod. 7. 1.* Other particular Angels are called Gods (it may be) twenty times in the Scriptures, by Confession of the ablest Critics and Interpreters of our Author's own Parry.

Nor is his first Answer a-whit better than the second, but rather less considerate and advised: He saith, *Moses* is not called God simply and absolutely, but with Limitation; he

is said to be a God to a particular Person, a God to Pharaoh; not absolutely God or a God. Now either he will abide by this Reply as found and good, or he will not. If he will not, then our Answer (that *Moses* as well as Christ is called God) remains in its full Force. But if he saith, he will abide by it as a good and sufficient Reply to us, then he hath given up to us that only Text, in which the Name God is bestowed on our Saviour: For the Socinians easily satisfy the more learned of their Opposers, that all the other Texts in which 'tis by some supposed that our Lord Christ is called God, were indeed intended, not of the Lord Christ, but of the Almighty Father, whom all acknowledged to be God: but the Words of St. Thomas (at *John* 20. 28.) Thomas said to him (to Jesus) my Lord and my God, are generally allowed, as well by Socinians as others, to be spoken to and of the Lord Christ. To this Text therefore Socinus answers, in the same manner that Mr. Lameth doth here concerning Moses, that the Lord Christ is not called God, simply and absolutely; but with Limitation to a particular Person, he was a God to Thomas: Thomas doth not say absolutely, O Lord God, but my Lord and my God; the personal Pronoun *my* limits the Sense of the Words to Thomas, and suffers us not to extend them, or take them in an absolute or a general Sense. For my part, I always thought this to be a frivolous shift, but it should seem Mr. Lameth approves of it; he thinks a Person is not really called a God, or hath not the Name God really given to him, if he is not called God absolutely, without Limitation to a particular Person. I say therefore, let him take his Choice; either let him say, he will not abide by this Answer; and then our Answer also (that *Moses* too is called God) will be sufficient and home; or let him abide by it, and then he has given up to us that only Text in which the Name God is given to the Lord Christ, even these Words of Thomas, *My Lord and my God*. But I desire you, Sir, to remember also, how clearly I have satisfied that Text, the Words of Thomas, at Chap. 6. p. 32, 33. of the Answer to Mr. Millbourn.

To his Proofs that the Attributes of God are ascribed to Christ.

HIS second Proof, or rather his second Class of Proofs, that the Lord Christ is God, is this, that the Attributes of the Divine Nature are ascribed to him no less than to God. And I will make choice, saith he, of six of the Divine Attributes to verify my Argument; Eternity, Immenfity, Holiness, Knowledge, Power and Mercy. These Properties, saith he, are in the Lord Christ, in such manner as belongs to God only; therefore the Lord Christ is also God.

First; For Eternity, he saith, 'tis proved to be in Christ, because the Author to the Hebrews (Ch. 1. 11.) applies to our Lord Christ what had been said by the Psalmist concerning God, namely these Words of Psal. 102. 26, 27. They (the Heavens) shall perish, but thou shalt endure; yea, all of them shall wax old like a Garment: as a Vesture shalt thou change them, and they shall be changed; but thou art the same, and thy Years have no end. He quoteth this Text to prove the Eternity of our Lord Christ; that I may use his own Words, not only the Eternity which is to come, but his Pre-eternity, or the Eternity which is past. If he had alledged it to prove the fifth Attribute, the Power of the Lord Christ, because 'tis here said, he shall change the Heavens: We would have informed him, that the Heavens here spoken of, are not the material Heavens, but the new Heavens and new Earth, or the Gospel-Oeconomy and State of things, as I have largely proved at Chap. 3. of the Answer to Mr. Millbourn. But seeing he citeth this Text to prove the Pre-eternity of our Saviour, or the Eternity which is past, we are constrained to answer in short, that (till he shows it more particularly) we cannot discern the least Shadow of a Pretence to draw that Conclusion from this Text.

But the same Epistle to the Hebrews saith, This Man (Jesus Christ) was counted worthy of more Glory than Moses; inasmuch as he who hath built

build the House hath more Honour than the House, *Hib. 3. 3.* We answer, the House here meant is *Domus Dei*, the Christian Church, of which the Lord Christ was (under God) the Builder; but this House was not from Eternity.

Next he quoteth *Hib. 7. 3.* *He was without Father and without Mother, without Descent; having neither Beginning of Days, nor end of Life.* But all Interpreters, of both Perswasions, are agreed, that these Words are spoken of *Mitchisedec*, whose Father and Mother, and the time of his Birth and Death, not being recorded any where in Scripture; he is therefore figuratively said to be without Father and Mother, without Beginning or End of Life. But he is not herein like to the Son of God, (the Time of whose Birth and Death is registered in Scripture, and whose Mother was Blessed Mary, his Father the everlasting God) but he is like the Son of God, in that he abideth a Priest for ever: Which he is said to do in respect of the Continuance (not of his Person, but) of his Priesthood, which ceaseth not, as did the Levitical, but is continued for ever in the Priesthood of the New Testament.

At *Hib. 9. 14.* 'tis said, that Christ through the eternal Spirit offered himself to God. This eternal Spirit Mr. Lamorb thinks was our Saviour's own eternal Spirit; but he hath not quoted the Place right: the Words are these, *Who, through the eternal Spirit, offered himself without Spot to God; i. e. the Lord Christ by the Co-operation of the Spirit and Grace of God, was sinless and spotless, and so offered himself as an immaculate Sacrifice to God.* The Emphasis lyeth not, in offering himself, or by the Spirit, but in offering himself without Spot, which was by the Co-operation of God's Grace or Spirit.

I see not what Weight or Force there is in his next Allegation, *Hib. 13. 8.* *Jesus the same Yesterday, to Day, and for ever.* When he tells us what he means by it, or how he forms an Argument from it, we will consider of it. But whereas he adds, that the Words at *Rev. 1. 8.* *I am Alpha and Omega, the Beginning and the Ending, saith the Lord, which is, and which was, and which shall be, the Almighty,* are

spoken of the Lord Christ; he should have proved it as well as said it, which when he does, we will give him the Cause: But he may see in the fourth Letter of the *Brief History of the Unitarians*, a demonstrative Proof, that the Words are spoken of God, not of the Lord Christ.

Come we now to the Attribute of Immen-sity, by which, he saith, our Saviour is present in all Places at the same time. For this he bringeth first those Words of our Saviour, *Where two or three are gathered together in my Name, I am in the midst of them,* *Matth. 18. 20.* We answer, Christ, though in Heaven, is in the midst of his People, partly by prophetick Vision and Knowledge, as St. Paul saith to the Colossians, *Though I be absent in the Flesh, I am present in the Spirit, saying and beholding your Order,* *Col. 2. 5.* And partly by that powerful Aid and Help which he affordeth to us; what by his Mediation with God for all in general, *Hib. 7. 25.* what by the Intervention of Angels, who are under his Directions, and by him engaged in the Defenoe of the Faithful, *Hib. 1. 14.*

As another Proof of our Saviour's Omnipresence, he gives us *John 3. 13.* *No Man hath ascended into Heaven, but he that came down from Heaven, even the Son of Man, which is in Heaven.* If he will needs have the last Words to be, *which is in Heaven*, contrary to all the considerable Criticks, who read here, *which WAS in Heaven*: We say, the Lord Christ was then in Heaven, was in Heaven while he was upon Earth; in the same Sense that St. Paul saith the like of himself, when he propoundeth himself for an Example to the Philippians, *Phil. 3. 20.* *Our Conversation is in Heaven:* Namely, by Heavenly-mindedness, an heavenly Frame of Spirit, by heavenly Meditations and Contemplations. Mr. Lamorb dismisses the Consideration of these two Attributes, Eternity and Immenstity, with this Reflection, that they are absolutely incommunicable to Creatures. But the most eminent Philosophers have been of Opinion, that they are both of them found in Matter or Bodies, as they speak. They suppose, that the *Makes,*

Matters



Matter or Substance of which the World is made, was from all Eternity; and that 'tis immense and interminable.

The third Attribute is *Holiness*; and the Lord Christ, saith our Author, *is holy, as God is holy*. He proves this, because the Prophet *Isaiah* heard the Seraphims make this Acclamation to God, *Holy, holy, holy is the Lord of Hosts*: And the Evangelist *St. John* assures us, that this Lord of Hosts whom the Seraphims praised, was our Lord Christ; *John 12. 41. These things said Isaiah, when he saw his Glory, and spake of him*. But the Criticks (both Fathers and Moderns) of our Author's own Party, plainly saw, that the Words of *St. John* are intended, not of the Lord Christ, but of God. They give two Reasons, which *Mr. Lameth* (in his next) may do well to remove. They observe, that the Words immediately foregoing are certainly spoken of God; and that the best Greek Copies read here expressly, *these things said Isaiah, when he saw GOD's Glory*.

He goes on; We say further, the Lord Christ knows whatsoever God knows. He thinks this wild Affirmation is proved by *St. Peter's* Words to our Saviour, *Thou knowest all things*, *John 21. 17*. And by what *St. John* says of him, *he knew all Men*; and again, *he knew what was in Man*, *John 2. 24, 25*. but especially by what our Saviour saith of himself, *I am he which searcheth the Reins and Hearts*, *Rev. 2. 23*.

Let us begin with the Words of *St. John*, that he (Christ) *knew all Men*, and *knew what was in Man*. The Occasion of these Words will shew us their Intent and Meaning; certain Persons upon hearing our Saviour's Doctrine, and seeing his Miracles, believed on him; nevertheless, saith this Evangelist, *Jesus committed not himself to them, because he knew all Men, and needed not that any should testify of Man, for he knew what was in Man*. As who should say, 'The Lord Christ was not free to commit his Person or his Secrets to these new Believers; he did not judge them fit to be trusted till they were well grounded and settled in the Faith: he knew what all Men are,

'how fickle and uncertain, nay oft-times designing and malicious; so he needed not that any should bid him be cautious, or aware of Men: Himself knew better than all Men the Infidelity, Treachery, Variableness, and all other Infirmities of Men; therefore he would not confide in Persons not known to him by some Experience first had of them. This is the natural and obvious Sense of *St. John's* Words; they are (very evidently) a Testimony of our Saviour's Prudence as a Man, not of his Omniscience as a God.

There is no more Force to *Mr. Lameth's* Purpose in *St. Peter's* Words to our Saviour, *Thou knowest all things*. The Lord Jesus had said to *Peter*, *Peter, lovest thou me?* *Peter* grieved that such a Question should be put to him, answers, *Lord, thou knowest all things, thou knowest I love thee*. His undoubted meaning is, *There is no Secret hid from thee; thou foreseest my Fall, my unhappy Weakness in denying thee; but neither is it hid from thee, that I love thee; and thou also lovedst thee, though for a Moment Fear overcame Love*. What is there in this Answer to perfwade any reasonable Man that *Peter* made his Master to be God, or believed another, a second God? *Thou knowest all Secrets*; but was not *Peter* aware that it was by Revelation from God, by God's inhabiting Spirit or Inspiration, that our Saviour and so many other Prophets knew all the Secrets of the Persons with whom they conversed? Let us see whether we cannot even wrest it from our Opposers, that all our Saviour's Knowledge, whether of Secrets or of things to come, was by Revelation from God; not from his own proper and natural Omniscience as God! *St. John* speaking of our Saviour, in his present State of Exaltation, has this Passage; *Rev. 1. 1. The Revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave to him, to shew to his Servants things that must shortly come to pass; and he (Christ) sent and signified it by his Angel (or by his Messenger) to his Servant John*. What Artifices, what Elusions or Shifts will *Mr. Lameth* betake him to, to get rid of this Text, which indeed putteth an End to the Question of our Saviour's Divinity! For were he indeed



deed God, were his Knowledge of all *Secrets* and of *things to come*, from his own Omniscience as God, it could never have been said of him, the *Revelation of Jesus Christ*, which God gave to him, to *shew to his Servants*.

Our Opposer's last Hope is in the Words of our Saviour, *I search the Reins and Heart*. He ought to know, that to *search the Heart* and *Reins* is an Hebrew and Scripture-Phrase or Form of speaking, and signifies no more but this, to *know the most secret Thoughts and Purposes of the Mind and Heart*. This Knowledge is originally in none but God; but it may be in others derivatively, by Derivation or Revelation from God. Only God knoweth the Reins and Heart originally of himself, or by his own proper and natural Omniscience; but Prophets, and more especially our Saviour, search and know the Hearts, *secondarily, derivatively, by God's Revelation to them*, or by his inhabiting Spirit in them. We are assured, that only this last was our Saviour's meaning, in these Words, *I search the Heart*; by the first Words of this Book of Revelation, before quoted, even these, *the Revelation of Jesus Christ*, which God gave to him. There could be no need that God should make a Revelation to him, if he himself knew the *Reins and Heart* by a natural Omniscience of his own. In one Word, we ought not to stick at the mere Syllables, *I search the Heart*, but should consider the Import or Sense of that Phrase in the Scripture-Language; If it signifies only thus much, to know the Thoughts of the Heart, or Mind, it will not prove the Person, of whom they are spoken, to be omniscient, or God, unless it be also said he knoweth the Heart by his own Omniscience, and not (as 'tis said of our Saviour) by Revelation from God, or God's inhabiting Spirit.

The fifth Attribute of God is his Power; and this Author fears not to say, at p. 40. the Lord Christ is *as powerful as God*. I marvel that a sensible Man could say such a thing; for *as powerful as God*, is plainly to say, *two Almighty's, and two Gods*. 'Tis impossible for Mr. Lamoth to evade this contradictory and blasphemous Consequence, but by another which will be as silly as this is impious.

He cannot escape it, but by saying, that the Lord Christ himself is that God; but then, *as powerful as God*, amounts to this, *as powerful as himself*. Hush Mr. Lamoth taken a Journey from France into England, to bless us with such a Discovery, that the Lord Christ is as powerful as himself, or is as powerful as he is powerful?

But here too we must examine his Proofs; our Saviour saith of himself, *John 5. 19. What things soever the Father doeth, those also doeth the Son*. Again he saith, *John 6. 40. He that believeth on me, hath eternal Life, and I will raise him at the last Day*. And St. Paul saith of him, *Phil. 3. 21. Who shall change our vile Body, that it may be like his glorious Body, according to the Working whereby he is able to subdue all things to himself*. Lastly, we have this Argument of our Saviour's Almighty Power, that St. John saith, *Without him was not any thing made that was made, John 1. 3. Which thing St. Paul dilates more largely in these Words; For by him were all things created that are in Heaven, and that are in Earth, visible and invisible;—all things were created by him and for him, Col. 1. 16.*

'Tis the perpetual Method, Sir, of our Opposers, to argue from imperfect broken Passages of Holy Scripture, concealing what goes before, and what follows after; as also how those Expressions are elsewhere interpreted by the Scriptures themselves. But the Reason of this is, never so little Sincerity in quoting the Scriptures would ruin their Cause. Be you Judge, Sir, whether this be not a just Charge: The Lord Christ, saith Mr. Lamoth, is *as powerful as God*; for he himself saith, *Whatsoever things the Father doeth, those also doeth the Son*: but he conceals what goes before in the same Verse, *Verily, verily I say to you, the Son can do nothing of himself: And what again follows at ver. 30. I can do nothing of my self*. He was aware that these (explicatory) Expressions would destroy his Argument from that part of the Verse which he alledged to prove that our Saviour is *another Almighty*: therefore he was resolved only to quote the Part of the Verse, which being separated from the rest, and repeated by it self, would seem to make for his Purpose. But if you

add to these Words which he hath dislocated from the rest, even to these, *What things the Father doeth, those also doeth the Son*: I say, if to these you add, *the Son can do nothing of himself*; and again, *I can of my self do nothing*; our Saviour's meaning will be clearly this; 'The Son raiseth the Dead, giveth Sight to the Blind, and doeth whatsoever else of that miraculous Nature that the Father himself sometimes doth; but 'tis with this immense Difference, that *the Son can do nothing of himself*, nothing by his own proper Authority or Power, but by the Power and Spirit of the Father dwelling in him, as in former Prophets. It is our Saviour himself, and after him the Apostle *Peter*, that make this Explanation, and give this Account of that miraculous Power of our Saviour, by which he did whatsoever things the Father doeth. John 14. 10. *The Father that dwelleth in me, he doeth the Works.* Matth. 12. 28. *I cast out Devils by the Spirit of God.* Acts 2. 22. *Jesus of Nazareth, a Man approved of God among you, by Miracles, and Wonders, and Signs, which God did by him in the midst of you.*

We have seen with what Confidence our Author quotes the Scriptures; I am desirous to make trial whether his Judgment be no greater than his Sincerity! Those Words of our Saviour which he is so desirous to conceal, the Son can do nothing of himself; and *I of my self can do nothing*: I beseech you, Sir, are they the Voice of God, or of a Man? Will he that is true God and Almighty, say, *I can of my self do nothing*; it is by the Power and Authority of another by which I do whatsoever I do!

Come we to his two next Places, that *Christ will raise Believers at the last Day*, and that he will *change their vile Bodies, so be like his glorious Body, according to that Power by which he is able to subdue all things to himself*. I will put a Question to this Gentleman: Doth Mr. Lamont think that the Lord Christ, in his present State of Exaltation, now raises (or will raise) the Dead, by any other Power but that by which he raised the Dead while he lived upon Earth? His Hypothesis will not allow him to say that the Lord Christ hath

now any greater or other Power than he had while he was upon Earth: It remains therefore that our Lord Christ will raise the Dead at the last Day, by the same Power by which he raised divers Persons in his Life-time. But I will demonstrate to him, that Power was not our Lord's *substant*, proper or own Power, but given to him by God, *pro veniata*, for the present Occasion, and that too at the Instance, or Prayer, or Suit of our Lord Christ to God. We see this very plainly in the case of *Lazarus*, whose vile Body (nay whose corrupted Body) was by him changed and restored to Life: For when Jesus came to the Grave of *Lazarus*, to call him forth to Life again, before he says, *Lazarus come forth*, he first devoutly owns by whose Power he enterprised this Miracle; see his Words, *John 11. 41. Jesus lift up his Eyes, and said, Father, I thank thee, that thou hast heard me: And I know that thou always hearest me; but because of the People which stand by, I say it, that they may believe that thou hast sent me.* When he had thus spoken, he cried with a loud Voice, *Lazarus, come forth.* I am willing, Sir, that our Opposers try all their Skill, use all their wile, or any new Elusions, to wrest this Text out of our Hands. Let them tell us, whether our Saviour doth not here attribute both his Power and Authority of raising this dead Person, to only the Prevalence of his Prayers with God, who always (saith he) *heareth me*. Let them tell us, if they dare, and if it destroys not their Hypothesis; that now however, in his State of Exaltation, the Lord Christ hath a new Power; and that he shall raise the Dead, not as while he was upon Earth, by an extraordinary Power conferred on him by God, (who hath sometimes given the same Power to dead and dry Bones, 2 Kings 13. 21.) but by a Power newly grown up in himself.

To the Text of St. *John* concerning the WORD, *without him was not any thing made that was made*; I have largely shown in the 5th Chapter of the Answer to Mr. *Aslibourer*, that the Evangelist is there speaking of the new Creation, or the Gospel Oeconomy and State of things, not of the outward, visible, or material Creation or World. If Mr. *Lamont* will

will satisfy the Reasons alledged in that Answer, the Socinians will be indebted to him for ever.

But he urges us, in the last Place, with St. Paul's Words, Col. 1. 16. *For by him were all things created, in Heaven and in Earth, visible and invisible; all things were created by him and for him.* It must be confess'd that this Allegation hath but one Fault. In the Judgment of all the Critics and Interpreters of Note, of our Author's own Party, *'tis most falsly translated: they read the Text after this manner, for by him (by the Lord Christ) were all things modelled that are in Heaven, and that are in Earth, visible and invisible; they were all modelled by him, and for him.* The invisible Powers of Heaven, even the Angelical Orders, and the State of Affairs upon Earth (more especially those of the Church) have undergone a very great Change, have been modelled, and as it were *new-made* by the Lord Christ. On Earth he hath abolished Paganism, Idolatry and Superstition, and introduced in their room the Knowledge of the one true God, and a moral Righteousness. In Heaven the Angelic Orders are put under his Directions, and by him engaged in the Defence of the Church, *Heb. 1. 14.* Mr. Lamoth may see in the fourth Letter of the *Brief History of the Unitarians*, how many learned Persons (Fathers and Moderns) of his own Party, have thus understood this Text: They plainly saw, that St. Paul speaks here of the new Creation, not of the original making, but the modelling or new-making of things: and I cannot think it necessary further to answer Monsieur Lamoth upon this Text, till he has satisfied the Reasons of the Judicious and Learned of his own Parry.

The last Attribute to evince that the Lord Christ is equal with God, is his *Mercy*. Our Author saith, Christ's Mercy is sufficient to demonstrate him to be true God. His Proof of this is, that St. Paul so commonly wishes *Grace and Peace to the Churches, from God the Father, and from our Lord Jesus Christ.* He saith at p. 43. An Apostle would be better advised than to wish them *Grace* from any other but only God: the Scriptures he saith, *never*

*tell us of the Grace of Angels or of Men.* He advances another Example of his Ignorance or his Forgetfulness, when he tells us, that 'tis said by our Saviour to the Disciples, *Baptize all Nations in the Name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.* And St. John saith, *There are three that bear Record in Heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: but in the Scriptures nothing that is created is made to go hand in hand with God, or is reckoned in the same Line or Period with him.* He adds further, but the Lord Christ is (in some Texts) not only reckoned with God, but is set before him, as in those Words of St. Paul, *The Grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Love of God, the Communion of the Holy Ghost be with you;* therefore without doubt he is true God. Can we imagine, saith this wary and judicious Author, that the Scriptures would have committed such an Absurdity, if the Son were no more than a Creature?

He is a pretty Gentleman; and seeing his Superiours have not thought fit to restrain his Extravagancies, 'tis necessary that his Opponent, who has the next Right, should. He is positive that Creatures are *never* set in the same Line or Context of Words and Sense with God, much less are set before him; and that Grace is *never* wished to the Churches from any but God. Now in his Hypothesis, the Lord Christ is God; therefore let him take his Bible, and find there this Text; *Rev. 1. 4, 5. John to the seven Churches which are in Asia, Grace be to you, and Peace, from him which is, and which was, and which is to come; and from the seven Spirits which are before his Throne, and from Jesus Christ.* Here Grace is wished from the seven Spirits of the Presence, and these are reckoned in the same Context of Words and Sense with God, and are set before our Saviour, who according to our Author, is true God. Nay, and the Author of this manner of speaking is St. John, that St. John on whom Mr. Lamoth hath bestowed some Pulpit-Rhetorick, telling us at p. 38. 'Let us make no Scruple to believe the beloved Disciple, who reposed himself on the Breast of the Son of God: Trust we to the piercing Sight of this Eagle, who took a View of

'this glorious Sun; Let us rely on the Testimony of the Evangelist, whose very End in writing his Gospel was to prove that Jesus Christ is the Son of God. With more such Pedantry, which however he taketh to be Wit.

*To what he saith concerning the Worship of Christ; and the Conclusion.*

WE are near our Deliverance from his Impertinencies: for at p. 44. he begins to speak to the last Argument of three, by which he undertook (at first) to prove our Saviour's Divinity, which is that *he is worshipped*. He saith here, that *Worship is* (as it were) *the Shadow of the Godhead*; let us therefore, saith he, *thereby take the Height and Elevation of our Saviour*. I shewed this Expression to a Friend of mine, asking him, what might be the meaning of it, or in what regard *Worship is* (as it were) *the Shadow of the Godhead*? He said, that I understood very little; for this is one of the *Mysteries* of the Trinitarians, which must be believed with an humble and implicit Faith, and not saucily pried into or enquired after. For all that I was of Opinion, that it hapned here to Monsieur *Lamoth* as to other Orators and eloquent Men, who when they come to the latter End of a Discourse, having well near spent their Embellishments and Flourishes, they fill up the vacant Spaces with a curious Mixture of *Flowish* and *Nonsense*. *Worship is* (as it were) *the Shadow of the Godhead*: there's the *Nonsense*; Mr. *Lamoth* himself will not deny it, upon second Thoughts, to be pure *Nonsense*. But then, *let us thereby take the Height and Elevation of our Saviour*; there's the *Flowish*, Decoration or Gild with which to cover it from Fools.

For the rest; Mr. *Lamoth* not having urged any thing from Scripture or Reason, for the *Worship* of our Saviour, but only what had been before said by Mr. *Milbourn*, to whom I have answered (so far as concerneth this Part of our Contest) at Chap. 10. of my Reply to him. I will pass now from the *argumentative* Parts of his Book to the *historical*;

for he hath obliged us with the History of a new French Synod, held at London by ninety six French Divines, *March 30, 1691*.

He gives us the Result and Conclusions of this either Synod or Riot (for it assembled by no legal Authority, and the Assistants at it are punishable by our Laws) in seven declaratory Propositions; which seven Propositions may however be reduced to these two, that the French Ministers are no Socinians, and that they are no Presbyterians. The first of these Declarations is wholly ridiculous; the other is equally surprising and unadvised; I will dispatch with both in two Words.

1. The French Ministers are no Socinians: Bless me! who ever said they were? Such as know the French Ministers, know very well that they are so far from being Socinians, that they never rightly understood what Socinianism is; they are so perfectly ignorant of the Merits of the Socinian Cause and Questions, that 'tis notoriously known, they are not conversant enough in good Books, to distinguish Socinianism from Remonstrantism: A Socinian and a Remonstrant are convertible Terms with the Generality of the French Ministers. Thence it is that their Brethren in Holland count the Clergy of the Church of England Socinians; because they are generally Remonstrants; and those Refugee Ministers who have joined in Communion with them, to be like as they are, unsound in the Faith.

2. They add, the French Ministers are (now) no Presbyterians. A foolish and a rash Declaration: What needed they to proclaim to all the Presbyteries here and abroad, that since their coming into England, they have turned their Coats? Was it worth their while to disown so publicly (as well as so causelessly and rashly) the original Discipline of their Church?

Let us hear how they have worded their famous Recantation; 'We heartily subscribe to the Confession of Faith of the Reformed Churches of France, without pretending to meddle with Matter of Discipline. They take here a civil Leave of Presbyterianism, and in a *Meiosis*, renounce the half of their Religion



gion at once: *We meddle not with Matters of Discipline*, that is, as we heartily profess the Points of Faith of our Churches, so we relinquish the Discipline of the same: They were not willing to *anathematize* the Presbytery, that had been somewhat too rigid for new Beginners and young Episcoparians. *But we meddle not with it*; we let it go in God's Name, to shift for it self, for we will be no longer concerned with it, or for it. I hope Mr. Quick will insert the Decrees of this London-Synod into his *Synodicon Gallie reformatæ*; that the World may know, that the French Ministers, to their other Virtues, have added also that of the Age, *totemporize*. Nor am I so much their Enemy, but that I wish them some Fruit of so great a Complaisance to the Church of England, as the giving up to her, at once, the *Moiety* of their Religion.

Mr. Lamoth hath acquainted the World, what the French Ministers are not; I cannot restrain my self from declaring what some of them (too many) are: They are Peepers, Lurchers and Trappans; they skulk about the Presses, Bookfellers Shops, and even at private Houses, to get Informations about *unlicensed* Books, and *heterodox* Opinions and Persons: They are Informers, not only in the Houses of Bishops, (who disdain at it) but in the Courts of Judicature, to the indelible and perpetual Scandal of their ministerial Function, as well as the Trouble and Danger of the Persons whom they illegally inform against, and prosecute for Matters of mere Conscience and Religion, or rather for their Love of Peace, and Desire of Catholick Unity.

Among the rest there is one Monsieur (I will conceal his Name for this once, but 'tis very like to) *Hocus*, who is excellent at the Discovery of an Heterodox Book, and at prosecuting the Author before the *Ecclesiastical* Judge, and then before the *Civil*. He is so brisk and home an Informer, that 'tis enough with him if a Book hath nothing *directly* heterodox, but only speaketh less considerately and advisedly, and so may have an Heterodox

or scandalous Construction put upon it: But withal he is so *suavely* false, that while he is informing and setting the Officers at work to apprehend, he will very solemnly deny that he was the Mover of this Trouble. If he and his Fraternity would not be further exposed, not only here, but in France, where they will be glad to hear the *evil Report* of the French Ministers; they will for the time to come take some honest Course to recommend themselves to the small Gratuities which they may expect from such Services; Services that are odious (I can assure them) to those very Persons for whose Interests they are done. I will conclude with minding them of two things; that 'tis dangerous for particular Men to irritate a whole Party by Prosecution, there being no Party that can be called small or weak. And next, that if they find themselves harshly answered in this Reply to Mr. Lamoth, let them remember that they have given us an insufferable Provocation, there being nothing so intolerable as that Refugees for Conscience, should turn Informers and Persecutors for Matters purely conscientious, for mere Dissent in Points of Faith.

But I have done with them for this time: If hereafter Mr. Lamoth, or any others, shall think fit to ingage in these Controversies, and can forbear reproachful Reflections on a whole Party, keeping themselves to Matter of Argument, and to the Mistakes of this particular Defendant, they shall be answered accordingly. I will reply as shall become a Christian and a Gentleman; I will as little be guilty of Disrespect, without a notorious Provocation in the same kind, as I will quarrel with a Person that informs me of my Way, when he perceives I am out of it. I need add no more now, but that, Sir, I receive respectfully the large and surprising Favours you have done to

Your most Obliged

and most Assured, &c.

POST-

# POSTSCRIPT.

**SIR,**  
I Send you herewith the Answer of one of our Friends, to the two Discourses of Mr. *Lamoth*, concerning the Divinity of our Saviour; if you send it to the Press, I pray let this present Supplement go along with it. For having seen the Articles of some French Ministers, exhibited at the Ecclesiastical Court of my Lord the Bishop of *L.* against Dr. *A. L.* at first I admired at the Impudence, the Boldness and Malice of their Undertaking; but afterwards I thought also it might be fit to take this Occasion, to mind them of some things, of which (I am perswaded) they have never duly thought.

In the first Place they have dared to article against a Person, in an Ecclesiastical Court, contrary to the *express* Words of a *Statute* or *Act* of Parliament: For the late Act of Parliament concerning Toleration and Indulgence in Matters of Conscience and Religion, granted to Socinians as well as other Protestants the Benefit of that Act, except only in Case that they shall *print* or *preach* in Defence and Vindication of their Opinions. The Socinians are as much tolerated and favoured by that Act as any other Sect of Dissenters from the Church of England, if they content themselves to hold their Opinions, or to reason and discourse of them in familiar Talk; the Act debarreth us from only the Liberty of *Preaching* or *Writing* in favour of them. But now the Person against whom the French Ministers article, hath committed no such Offence; they do not so much as pretend that he has *written* or *preach'd* against the received Doctrine of the Church: these Ministers therefore are guilty of an Insult upon the English Laws, and the Statutes of our Kings and Parliaments; and are liable to a Prosecution thereupon in the Civil Courts, by the Persons whom they have particularly wronged, or by any other public-spirited Persons, to whom the Liberties of the Nation are dear. They may happen to find some not obscure Persons, who in due Place and Time will make the Mi-

nisters sensible, that 'tis not for *Refugees* to trample upon the Laws of the Country where they are received and protected; and least of all upon those Laws which were made and designed for the Ease and Peace of the Nation, and on which the Welfare and Safety of the Nation do much depend.

But the Person, it should seem, against whom they article, hath no need of any Relief from the Act of Indulgence; he is accused by the Ministers as a Socinian, only because he is not a Sabellian, and because he holds the *Necessity* of good Works. They article, that he hath (*maliciously and wickedly*) affirmed, speaking concerning the Blessed Trinity, that he could clearly prove, that *three are not one*, and that *one and two are three*. He answers, that he meant thereby, that *three Persons are not one Person*; that is, he is no Sabellian, he believeth the real Distinction of the Persons, or as the Athanasian Creed saith, he confoundeth not the Persons. They article, that he hath (*maliciously and heretically*) said, that *Jesus Christ hath merited nothing for us*, and that he hath but done what he was obliged to do; or Words to that effect. He answers, that his Words were not to that Effect; the true and whole meaning of his Words was only this, that the Merit and Satisfaction of the Lord Christ is to be so interpreted, as not to destroy, supersede or dispense with good Works of our own, that is to say, a holy Life on our Part. This indeed is to be no Calvinist; but for all that, 'tis neither Heresy nor Socinianism; but it serves to confirm what our Friend hath said in his Answer to Mr. *Lamoth*, that 'tis notoriously known, that the French Ministers understand not what Socinianism is, and that they confound Socinianism with Arminianism or Remonstrantism. I am sorry for this same honest Dr. *A. L.* because though it appears by these and the rest of his Answers, that he is no Socinian, yet he is for the *Necessity* of Holiness, a good Life, or good Works; which Doctrine was ever so displeasing to Mr. *Calvin* and his Followers, the French



French Ministers, that sometimes they deny there is any such thing as good Works; and otherwhile they affirm, that good Works are not only no necessary Conditions of Salvation, but are even pernicious, dangerous and destructive thereof. They are so much of this Mind, that they make the contrary Doctrine to be *Heresy*; and because they think they cannot any way render it more odious, they call it *Socinianism*; but I advise them, seeing Popery is now so much abominated in *England*, that they would rather call it *Jesuitism*; they should have prosecuted this Dr. A. L. as a *Jesuit* rather than as a *Socinian*; that had been a way to set the *Rabble*, as well as the Spiritual Court, upon him.

But if Socinianism and the English Socinians are indeed such Eye-sores to these Ministers, as seems by their frequent Prosecutions of divers Persons on that Account before the Ecclesiastical Judges, and in other Courts, they should at least have shewn so much Justice, as not to misplace their Accusations, so grossly too, as they have done. This Dr. A. L. is the fourth or fifth Person to whom they have given a Publick Trouble, on the Account of Socinianism: they have been always baffled, and sometimes severely check'd by the Judges and Court; all this has not discouraged them, they having no Reputation to lose, from renewing their *Persecutions* of innocent Persons. But I advise them much, to lay the Saddle upon the right Horse; and let them not so wholly despise the Imputations of Calumny and Malice, Vices so unfutable to their Profession of Ministers: Let them cease to accuse those that are not guilty, when they may easily find so many who are not only guilty of Unitarianism, if it be a Guilt, but are also liable upon that Account; my meaning is, have preach'd up and written for Unitarianism. They have, for Instance, the four Evangelists and the Apostles, notoriously guilty of the Heresy now called Socinianism; and their Words are so clear and express for it, that the Ministers need not fear the Imputation of Slander, if they shall article against them at the Places and Courts where they have lately libell'd Dr. L. and Mr. Gr. If the Reader will pardon me, and not abate

of his due Reverence, I will be content to prepare the Articles for the Ministers, in their own Forms and Terms; they shall have no other Trouble but what they so much affect and like, even to exhibit them in the Civil and Ecclesiastical Courts.

1. You *Matthew*, stiled Apostle; and you *Mark*, called an Evangelist, have *mal. and vic.* conspired together, to teach and write the Heresy which denieth the *Omniscience* of the Son our Lord Christ, while you have reported and published, as from the Mouth of Christ himself, that *the Son knoweth not the Time of the last Judgment*; and that only the *Father* (whom all Men grant not to be the Son) *knoweth of that Day*, Mat. 24. 36. Mark 13. 32.

2. You *John*, calling you self Evangelist and Apostle, have not spared to write and publish scandalous, heretical and blasphemous Words against the *Omnipotence* of the same our Lord Christ, affirming most injuriously and falsely, that *he can do nothing of himself*; and further, that it was not *he*, but the *Father dwelling in him*, that did all the *miraculous Works*. So you have said expressly, *John* 5. 19, 30. *John* 14. 10. With which monstrous Doctrine you *Prav* also symbolized when you preached to the Jews concerning the Lord Christ: for thus you say of him; *Jesus of Nazareth, a Man approved of God among you, by Miracles and Wonders, and Signs, which God did by him*, Acts 2. 22. Et objicimus & articulamus ut supra.

3. You the said *John*, not having the *Faith* of — before your Eyes, but led by an heretical and blasphemous Spirit, have written and published, and as from the Mouth of our Saviour, that *the Father is greater than he*, *John* 14. 28. To which Heresy you *Paul* have consented, when you do write to the Corinthians, that *the Head of the Woman is the Man, and the Head of Christ is God*, 1 Cor. 11. 3. But the divine *Athanasius* hath in his Creed expressly contradicted you.

4. And further, you *John* have written and published Words, in which 'tis evident that you designing to deny the *supreme Authority* of the Son our Lord Christ; for you make him to say, that *he came not of himself*, but *as sent by the Father*, and that his Doctrine was not his own, but the *Father's* that sent him; and that as

the Father had commanded him, so in all things *spake he*; John 8.42. John 8.28. John 12.49.

5. You *Luke*, called also an Evangelist, have been yet more audacious; you have published to the World, that the Lord Christ was not only not God, but that he needed to be strengthened in his Agonies before his Passion by an Angel, and that he prayed earnestly to God; as if he who was himself God, and the only true God, could need the Aid of an Angel, or to make Prayer to any whomsoever. The others, your Companions in this Heresy, have with some Modesty contented themselves to deny our Saviour's Omnipotence; but you have represented him, as in some Respects, impotent and weak, Luke 22. 43, 44.

6. All of you, jointly and severally, have spoken of God by only the singular Pronouns, *I, Thou, Me, Him, Himself, Thy self*, and such like; which Pronouns are never used in any Language but only of one single Person, not of more Persons; and hereby you have fully assured us, that your Belief is, that there is but one Person of God, not three Persons, or a Trinity of Persons. But you *Paul* have presumed to say, even in Terms, that God is but one Person: for you write to the Hebrews, that *the Son is* (what, God? No, but) *the Image of God's Person*, Heb. 1. 3.

7. To leave no Place for doubt, you *John* and *Paul* have expressly taught and published, that only the Father is true God; and him you make to be even the God of the Son, or the God whom the Son worshippeth and serveth: You have said and written, Father, — *This is Life eternal, to know thee (the only true God) and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent*: or, *Jesus Christ thy Messenger*. And again; *To us there is but one God, the Father*: — and one Lord (or one Master, that is, Teacher) *Jesus Christ*. And you *Paul*, above all others, have inculcated and repeated this Doctrine: You tell the Corinthians, that *Christ shall deliver up the Kingdom to God, even the Father*. And you advise the Romans, that *with one Mouth they should glorify God, even the Father*. Plainly, as if only the Father were God; *John* 17. 1, 3. *1 Cor.* 8. 6. *1 Cor.* 15. 24. *Rom.* 15. 6.

8. To burden you at present with no more;

All of you, jointly and severally, have in such manner distinguished between God and the Lord Christ, that your way of speaking amounts to a plain Denial, that the Lord Christ is God. You make our Saviour himself to say to the young Man whom he loved, *Why callest thou me Good? there is none Good save one, that is God*. You say, *There is one God, and one Mediator between God and Men, the Man Jesus Christ*. You exhort, *Let every Tongue confess that Jesus Christ is Lord* (Gr. that the Lord Jesus is the Christ) *to the Glory of God, the Father*. You cry out, *To God only Wise be Glory, through Jesus Christ*. You have taught, that *the Son shall be subject to him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all*; *Luke* 18. 19. *1 Tim.* 2. 5. *Phil.* 2. 11. *Rom.* 16. 27. *1 Cor.* 15. 28. If we put all these Expressions together, you are found to deny the Omniscience, the Omnipotence, and the supreme Authority of the Lord Christ: and in some Cases you make him to be even impotent and weak; and having thus divested him, as much as in you lies, of all the Grand Characters and Attributes of the Divine Nature, you add, that God is but one Person, and that this one Person is only the Father, and that Christ is a Man, whom we must always carefully distinguish from God.

Thus it is, and these are the Men against whom the French Ministers (in pursuance of their Principles) should have acted, in the Ecclesiastical Courts: these are the true Unitarians, and Fathers of Unitarianism, on whom the Blame and Charge should light. 'Tis in vain for the Ministers to rail at, and be reformers (in a strange Land) against modern Unitarian Books and Persons, unless they can first get the Apostles and Evangelists censured, and their Writings suppressed. But in presenting the Articles, I would have Mr. *Lamoth* be Foreman, because they are sure to his Doctrine. I need not, Sir, add any more; I am of Opinion that the Ministers, for one while, may have enough of this.

I am your Assured,

E. E.

